

## **REMARKS**

Applicants reply to the Office Action dated April 2, 2007. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 16, and 17 were pending in the application and the Examiner rejects claims 1, 3, 4, 6-13, 16, and 17. Support for the amendments may be found in the originally-filed specification, claims, and figures. No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph**

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-4, 6-13, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner notes that claim 1 “recites, ‘determining a source of said product feed, wherein said source is at least one of suppliers and said providers’ however in the previous retrieving step, the claim explicitly teaches that the product feed originates from providers only” (page 3, paragraph 4). Applicants amend claim 1 to clarify that that the plurality of web sites are associated with suppliers (e.g., manufacturers) and/or providers (e.g., merchants, retailers).

### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-4, 6-13, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Smith, U.S. Patent No. 6,895,388. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Smith generally discloses a system that provides users with a more robust online shopping environment. Specifically, the Smith system provides information to potential customers that may influence the decision as to whether or not to purchase the item from a particular merchant. Smith discloses that such information includes, for example, inventory and number of items that are in the manufacturing pipeline. As this information can determine how long a potential customer can expect to wait for shipment of a product, the potential customer is able to comparison shop at a level not provided by prior art online shopping systems.

In regard to the Applicants’ claim elements pertaining to how image data is retrieved based upon whether a product feed is received from a merchant or from a manufacturer, the Examiner recites a section of Smith disclosing processing steps for retrieving information relating to a product selection by a potential customer. Specifically, the Examiner cites column 7, lines 10-24, which recite the following steps:

A. Consumer selects a particular vehicle from a list that is displayed on a web page.

- B. A unique vehicle identifier is sent to a client computer configured to locate information.
- C. The client computer generates a request message including the vehicle identifier and sends it to a server.
- D. The server sends a query to an inventory database, and detailed information about the vehicle, including a URL to a photo of the vehicle is retrieved from the database.
- E. The server sends the inventory database information to the client computer where it is stored and displayed on the consumer's web page.

Applicants note that the recited section of Smith does not disclose how images are retrieved from different sources based on the step of determining whether the source is a supplier or a provider. Smith discloses only that a URL to an image is retrieved from an inventory database. Thus, not only does Smith fail to teach retrieving an image from either a supplier or a provider based on an explicit determining step, but **significantly, Smith fails to teach extracting an image (rather than an image URL) from a product feed when the source is a supplier, and extracting an image from a website when the source is a provider.** As such, Smith does not disclose or suggest at least, "determining a source of said product feed, wherein said source is at least one of suppliers and said providers", "extracting an image from said product feed when said source is said supplier", and "retrieving an image from a website of said provider when said source is said provider," as disclosed by independent claim 1.

Claims 3-4, 6-13, 16, and 17 variously depend from independent claim 1. Applicants assert that dependent claims 3-4, 6-13, 16, and 17 are differentiated from the cited references for at least the same reasons as set forth above, as well as their own respective features.

Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. **19-2814**. Applicants invite the Office to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner has any questions regarding this Reply or the present application in general.

Dated: 2/2/07

**SNELL & WILMER L.L.P.**  
400 E. Van Buren, One Arizona Center  
Phoenix, Arizona 85004  
Phone: 602-382-6228  
Fax: 602-382-6070  
Email: [hsobelman@swlaw.com](mailto:hsobelman@swlaw.com)

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Howard I. Sobelman, Reg. No. 39,038